UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,435	02/27/2004	Adrian Buckley	1578.702 (11609-US-PAT)	5695
44208 DOCKET CLE	7590 01/06/200 RK	9	EXAMINER	
PO BOX 12608			BHATTACHARYA, SAM	
DALLAS, TX 75225			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/789,435	BUCKLEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SAM BHATTACHARYA	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 S This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4)	wn from consideration. 231-38 is/are rejected.	cation.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 19-23, 24-28, 31, 33-35, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch et al. (US 2004/0028009) in view of H'mimy et al. (US 6,442,151) and Friman et al. (US 6,741,858).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 21, 22 and 26, Dorenbosch discloses a mobile device for wireless channel selection (see FIGS. 1 and 2), the mobile device 103 communicating with a wireless network, including a first transceiver 808 for creating a first connection with the wireless network over a first channel; a second transceiver 809 for creating a second connection with the wireless network over a second channel; a memory, the memory 815 containing a list of candidate channels and their characteristics and containing service criteria associated with a service; and a switching module 811 coupled to the first and second transceivers, the switching module directing the first transceiver to create the first connection, establishing the service between the mobile device and a remote point over the first connection, selecting the second channel, and directing the second transceiver to create the second connection. See also FIG. 8, paragraph 16, lines 1-12, and paragraph 19, lines 1-21.

Dorenbosch fails to disclose that the switching module reads the list of candidate channels and compares their characteristics against the service criteria to select the second

Art Unit: 2617

channel and wherein the switching module switches the service from the first connection to the second connection.

However, in an analogous art, H'mimy et al. discloses a channel assignment system that includes a switching module 30 that reads the list of candidate channels and compares their characteristics against the service criteria to select the second channel and wherein the switching module switches the service from the first connection to the second connection. See FIG. 1, col. 3, lines 23-35 and col. 6, lines 18-34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Dorenbosch by incorporating this feature as taught by H'mimy for the purpose of ensuring that the optimal channel is selected for communication so that communication is not dropped.

Dorenbosch-H'mimy failst to disclose that the characteristics of the second channel do not meet the service criteria, and adapting the service to the characteristics of the second channel.

However, in an analogous art, Friman discloses this feature the text of claims 1 and 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Dorenbosch-H'mimy by incorporating this feature as taught by Friman for the purpose of achieving an optimum data rate to be used for communication.

Regarding claims 5, 16, 23, 28, 31 and 35, Dorenbosch discloses that the characteristics include bandwidth and the service criteria include a minimum bandwidth requirement. See paragraph 21, lines 1-16.

Regarding claims 8, 19, 34 and 38, Dorenbosch discloses that the step of creating a second connection includes steps of selecting the second channel and requesting resources from the wireless network. See paragraph 17, lines 1-19 and pargraph 18, lines 1-21.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Dorenbosch discloses that the wireless network includes an anchor point and wherein the first connection includes a first path to the anchor point, and wherein the step of creating a second connection includes establishing a second path to the anchor point. See paragraph 25, lines 1-22.

Regarding claim 13, 33 and 37, Dorenbosch discloses that the switching module directs the first transceiver to terminate the first connection once the service is switched to the second connection. See paragraph 23, lines 1-20.

3. Claims 6, 17, 24, 29, 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch in view of H'mimy et al. and Friman, and further in view of Boudreaux (US 6,466,556).

Regarding claims 6, 17, 24, 29, 32 and 36, Dorenbosch-H'mimy-Friman fails to disclose that the characteristics for channel evaluation include latency and the service criteria include a latency requirement.

However, in an analogous art, Boudreaux discloses a handover method in which service criteria for channel evaluation include a latency requirement. See col. 1, lines 47-60. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Dorenbosch-H'mimy-Friman by including this feature taught in Boudreaux for the purpose of compensating for rapid fluctuations in delay and loss.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (571) 272-7917. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sb

/Sam Bhattacharya/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617